Case 2:13-cv-01966 JS 44 Rev. 12/07) The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the it is a managed to a mained herein neither by local rules of court. This form, and the by the Judicial Conference	replace nor supplem of the United States			1966 ired by law, except as provided ourt for the purpose of initiating		
he civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUMENT NS IN THE REVERSE OF	THE FORM.)	DEFENDANTS				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		Greyhound Lines, Inc.				
Mahady Sako		C CD dam on of First	Listed Defendant			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pennsylvani (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Bernard Smalley, Esquire Joe H. Tucker, Jr., Esquire TUCKER LAW GROUP, LLC 1617 JFK Boulevard Philadelphia, PA 19103	Thomas J. McKenzie, Jr., Esquire Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin 2000 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 / 215-575-3562					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box On	nly) III. C	TIZENSHIP OF PRIM	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla ar	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF		
1 U.S. Government		izen of This State 🔲 1	Incorporated or Principal of Business In This Incorporated and Principal 2	State		
2 U.S. Government	Item III)	tizen of Another State 2	other State			
		Foreign Country	1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			
100 Instrument 120 Marine 1310 Airplane 362 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 196 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 197 CIVIL RIGHTS 198 Contract Product Liability 198 Franchise 199 Contract Product Liability 199 Contract Product Liability	RSONAL INJURY Personal Injury— Med. Malpractice Personal Injury— Product Liability Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability ONAL PROPERTY Other Fraud Truth in Lending Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability ONER PETITIONS OMotions to Vacate Sentence Abeas Corpus: OGeneral Deneral De	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 750 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration Actions	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 394 Energy Allocation Act 395 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) ☐ 1 Original Proceeding State Court 3 Remanded fr Appellate Co	ourt Reop		t 6 Multidistrict Litigation	Appeal to District 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment ty):		
	Plaintiff allege	s that he suffered person yhound Terminal.	al injuries as a result of	a physical altercation he		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CIUNDER F.R.C.P. 23	LASS ACTION	DEMAND in excess of \$50,	000 CHECK YES JURY DEM	S only if demanded in complaints (AND: Yes No		
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		ODNEY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE S April 10, 2013	IGNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEY OF RECORD	- nn'	13		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	YING IFP	JUDGE	PR MAG JUDGE	American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA - DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

assign	mem	to appropriate	Calcindar.								
Addres	ss of P	laintiff	4605 Chester Avenue,	Apartment 3A, J	Philadelphia, PA	19143					
Addres	ss of D	Defendant	350 North St. Paul Stro	et, Dallas, Texa	s 72501		\rightarrow				
		ident, Incident		. /	Terminal Phila	α	se Reverse	Side for Addition	nal Space,)	
Does t	his civ	il action involv	e a nongovernmental co	porate party wit	h any parent com	oration and an	y publicly l	neld corporation	owning	10% or more of it	s stock?
			Disclosure Statement For						Yes 🛛		
Does t	his car	se involve mult	district litigation possib	ilities?				(Yes 🗌	No ⊠)	
		CASE, IF							٠ _	///	
Case 1				Judge _					Date Terr	minated	-,
Civil	eases a	are deemed relat	ed when yes is answered	i to any of the fo	ollowing question	s:					
1.			property included in an				ar previous	ly terminated ac	ction in th	nis court?	
1.								•	Yes 🗍	No □	قسينه دين
2.	Does	this case invol	ve the same issue of fact	or grow out of t	the same transact	ion as a prior su	uit pending		rear previ Yes □		action in this court?
									_	_	
3.			ve the validity or infring	ement of a pater	nt already in suit	or any earlier n	umber case	pending or wit	hin one y	ear previously ten	minated action in this
	cour	t?							Yes 🔲	No 🗆	
			or successive habeas co	social soci	urity appeal or n	ro se civil rights	s case filed	by the same inc	dividual?		
4.	Is th	is case a second	or successive nadeas co	rpus, sociai sect	inty appear, or pr	O SC CIVII TIGIL	, case mea	oy the banc in	Yes 🔲	No □	i
CIVII	L: (P	lace ✓ in ONE	CATEGORY ONLY)								
Α.	Fede	eral Question Ca	ses:			В.	Diversity	Jurisdiction Cas			
1.		Indemnity Co	ntract, Marine Contract,	and All Other Co	ontracts	1.		Insurance Co	ntract an	d Other Contracts	
2.		FELA				2.		Airplane Pers	sonal Inju	ury	
3.		Jones Act-Per	sonal Injury			3.		Assault, Defa	amation		
		Antitrust	,			4.		Marine Perso	nal Injur	У	
4.	_					5.		Motor Vehic	le Person	al Injury	
5.		Patent	(Daladana			6.	\			(Please specify) P	remises Liability
6.		_	ement Relations			7.		Products Lia	-	(·
7.		Civil Rights						Products Lia		A chastos	
8.		Habeas Corpu	IS			8.			•		
9.		Securities Ac	(s) Cases			9.		All other Div			
10.		Social Securit	y Review Cases					(Please spec	ify)		\
11.		All other Fed	eral Question Cases					/	. T. 4	0.20	
		(Please specif	y)					(AP	17		
				ARB!	ITRATION (CERTIFIC					
_			1 1 1		(спеск арргор	, in company,	•	_			
I,	, c	ounsel of record	I do hereby certify: al Civil Rule 53.2, Section	. 2(-)(2) that to	the best of my let	owledge and be	lief the da	mages recoveral	ble in this	civil action case e	xceed the sum of
		\$150,000.00 ex	clusive of interest and c	osts;	the best of my ki	lowledge and be	mer, me da	mages recovera	oi o in u iic	, 0. 77.11 0.0.1 0.11 0.11 0.0 0	
		Relief other tha	in monetary damages is	sought.	MI	l -			R	11/82	
DAT	E _	9/11/	13	16 ham	02 9 11V	henry			0	Attorney I.D. #	
		, ,	NOTE: A trial d	e novo will b	e a trial by ju	ry only if the	ere has b	een complia	nce wit	h F.R.C.P. 38.	
1 cer	rtify tl	hat, to my knov	wledge, the within case								ourt except as noted
abo		. 1	-		TA	KMM 1	/ -		871	<70	
DAT	ΓE _	4/11/13	3		Attorney-at-	4 11 6/2 Law	empe		04	Attorney I.D	0.#

Case 2:13-cv-(N) 99966 VUNITED STRATES DISTRICT/COMBRT Page 3 of 19 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

:

CIVIL ACTION

13

1966

GREYHOUND LINES, INC

NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus-Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. §2241through §2255.
- (b) Social Security-Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.
- (c) Arbitration-Cases require to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos-Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.
- (e) Special Management-Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)
- (f) Standard Management--Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

April 10, 2013 Date	Thomas J. McKenzie, Jr., Esquire Attorney-at-law	Greyhound Lines, Inc. Attorney for			
215-575-3562 Telephone	215-575-0856 FAX Number	tjmckenzie@mdwcg.com E-Mail Address			

#01966-WY Document 1 Filed 04/12/13 Page 4 of 19

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

\$350, 8ase

CIVIL ACTION - LAW MAHADY SAKO, JR. **Plaintiff** 1966 v. NO. GREYHOUND LINES, INC. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED Defendant MAHADY SAKO, JR. COURT OF COMM PHILADELPHIA C Plaintiff ٧. NOVEMBER, 2012 NO. 02684 GREYHOUND LINES, INC. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED Defendant

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc., by and through its counsel, Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441 and 1446, file this Notice of Removal of a certain action pending in the Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, (hereinafter "State Court"), and in support thereof states as follows:

- 1. Greyhound Lines, Inc. is a Defendant in the action entitled *Mahady Sako v*. *Greyhound Lines*, pending in State Court.
- Greyhound Lines, Inc. was duly served with the Civil Action Complaint on March 28,
 True and accurate copies of the Civil Action Complaint and docket entries from the State
 Court are attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

3. The foregoing papers are, upon information and belief, the only process, pleadings and orders in the State Court served upon Greyhound Lines, Inc.

4. Plaintiff is a citizen of the United States and currently resides at 4605 Chester Avenue, Apartment 3A, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

5. Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business located at 350 North St. Paul Street, Dallas, Texas 72501.

6. Plaintiff's alleged damages exceed \$75,000.00.

7. This action is one in which this Honorable Court has original jurisdiction under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1441(a), in that it is a civil action wherein Plaintiff has alleged that the damages in controversy exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs and is between citizens of different states. In accordance with Title 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), this Notice of Removal is filed within 30 days after service upon the Greyhound Lines, Inc.

8. Greyhound Lines, Inc. desires to remove this action to this Court and submits this notice along with the exhibits, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441, and 1446.

9. Written notice of the filing of this Notice of Removal will be given to Plaintiff, and a copy of this Notice of Removal and supporting papers will be filed with the Clerk of the State Court, as provided by 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).

WHEREFORE, Defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc., pray that the above described action pending against it in the State Court be removed to this Court.

> MARSHALL DENNEHEY WARNER **COLEMAN & GOGGIN**

Thomas P. Wagner, Esquire Thomas J. McKenzie, Jr., Esquire 2000 Market Street, Suite 2300 Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-575-2600

Attorneys for Defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc.

Dated: April <u>1</u>, 2013

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

SS

COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA

AFFIDAVIT

THOMAS J. MCKENZIE, JR. ESQUIRE, being duly sworn according to law deposes and states that the facts set forth in the foregoing Notice of Removal are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

THOMAS J. MCKENZJE, JR., ESQUIRE

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED

OF

, 2013

NOTARÝ PÚBLIC

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

NOTARIAL SEAL

Audrey M. Gaffney, Notary Public City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County My commission expires July 01, 2014

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice of Removal was sent by First Class mail, postage prepaid, to the following counsel of record:

Bernard Smalley, Esquire Joe H. Tucker, Jr., Esquire TUCKER LAW GROUP, LLC 1617 JFK Boulevard Philadelphia, PA 19103

MARSHALL DENNEHEY WARNER COLEMAN & GOGGIN

Thomas P. Wagner, Esquire

Thomas J. McKenzie, Jr., Esquire

Attorneys for Defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc.

DATE: April <u>//</u>, 2013

EXHIBIT "A"

TUCKER LAW GROUP, LLC Bernard Smalley, Esquire (I.D. No. 35658) Joe H. Tucker, Jr., Esquire (I.D. No. 56617) 1617 JFK Boulevard Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 875-0609

MAHADY SACKO, JR. 4605 Chester Avenue Apartment 3A Philadelphia, PA 19143

Plaintiff,

VS.

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. 116 Pine Street, Suite 320 Harrisburg, PA 17101

Defendants.



COURT OF COMMON PLEAS PHILADELPHIA COUNTY NOVEMBER TERM, 2012 NO: 2684

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT - NOTICE TO DEFEND

NOTICE

You have been sued in court. If you wish to defend against the claims set forth in the following pages, you must take action within twenty (20) days after this complaint and notice are served, by entering a written appearance personally or by attorney, and filing in writing with the court your defenses or objections to the claims set forth against you. You are warned that if you fail to do so the case may proceed without you and a judgment may be entered against you by the court without further notice for any money claimed in the complaint or for any other claim or relief requested by the plaintiff. You may lose money or property or other rights important to you.

You should take this paper to your lawyer at once. If you do not have a lawyer or cannot afford one, go to or telephone the office set forth below to find out where you can get legal help.

Philadelphia Bar Association Lawyer Referral and Information Service 1101 Market Street-11th Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107 (215) 238-6333

AVISO

Le han demandado a usted en la corte. Si usted quiere defenderse de estas demandas expuestas en las paginas siguientes, usted tiene veinte (20) dias de plazo Angie Y. Lugo partir dela fecha de la demanda y la notificacion. Hace falta asentar una comparencia escrita o en persona o con un abogado y entregar a la corte en forma escrita sus defensas o sus o objectiones a las demandas en contra de su persona. Sea a visado que si usted no se defiende, la corte tomara medidas y puede continuar la demanda en contra suya sim previo a viso o notification. Ademas, la corte puede cumpla con todas las provisiones de esta demanda. Usted puede perer dinero o sus propiedades u otros derechos imporatantes para usted.

Lleva esta demanda a un abogado immediatamente. Si no tiene abogado o si no tiene el dinero suficiente de pagar tal servico. Vaya en personal o llame por telefono Angie Y. Lugo la oficina cuya direccion se encuentra escrita abajo para averiguar donde se puede conseguir asistensia legal.

Asociacion de Licenciados de Filadelphia Servicio de Referencia e Informacion Legal 1101 Market Street-11th Floor Filadelfia, Pennsylvania 19107 (215) 238-6333

- 1. Plaintiff, Mahady Sacko, Jr., is an adult individual who resides at 4605 Chester Avenue, Apartment 3A, Philadelphia, PA 19143.
- 2. Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc., is a corporation and/or business entity located at 15110 North Dallas Parkway, Suite 600, Dallas, Texas 75284. At all times relevant hereto Greyhound Lines, Inc. regularly advertised and conducted business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 3. At all times relevant hereto, defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc., was in the exclusive possession management and control of the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal located at 1001 Filbert Street in Philadelphia PA 19107.
- 4. Mr. George Wadis ("Wadis"), is an adult individual who currently incarcerated at Philadelphia Detention Center, 8210 State Road, Philadelphia, PA 19136.

FACTS

- 5. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations and facts set forth in paragraphs 1 through 4 above as if set forth herein at length.
- 6. On or about December 1, 2010, plaintiff was business invitee lawfully on the premises of the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal waiting to purchase a bus ticket.
- 7. While plaintiff was waiting in queue at the Philadelphia Greyhound
 Terminal, which is owned, operated, maintained and in the possession of defendant
 Greyhound Lines, Inc., security personnel, staff and management allowed for Mr.
 George Wadis to enter into their facility with a deadly weapon.
 - 8. At or about 2:30pm on the aforementioned date, Mr. Wadis, approached

plaintiff, and began to verbally harass and assault the plaintiff in a loud manner bringing attention to himself and the plaintiff by those then present, without provocation or cause.

- Plaintiff attempted to get away from Mr. Wadis, repeatedly pleading with 9. him to end his verbal assault of the plaintiff, but Wadis continued to violently shout at plaintiff, again bringing attention to himself and the plaintiff by those then present, without provocation or cause.
- Wadis then became further enraged and without provocation or cause, 10. and with an intent to cause immediate fear and harmful contact, pulled out a large knife and violently slashed the plaintiff's face causing him to sustain significant, permanent and disfiguring personal injuries.
- Wadis' assault and battery was unprovoked and in no manner whatsoever 11. due to any act on the part of the plaintiff.
- During the prolonged verbal and physical assault there was no security 12. guard present and available to provide aid to the plaintiff, protect the customers, passengers, patrons and staff on the premises, or safely prevent or diffuse the situation.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. only had 13. one security guard on duty during the time of the verbal and physical assault.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc.'s only on-14. duty security guard was located outside of the building while plaintiff was left to be verbally and physically assaulted ultimately resulting in plaintiff sustaining several serious injuries including but not limited to a permanent, disfiguring facial scar.

COUNT I- NEGLIGENCE Plaintiff Mahady Sacko, Jr. v. Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc.

- 15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all allegations set forth herein in paragraphs 1 through 14.
- 16. At all times relevant hereto Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. owned, operated, administered, controlled, managed and/or maintained all operations, administrative, supervisory and security staff at the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal.
- 17. Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc., created, controlled, and deployed its own security staff to purportedly protect and secure the safety of its customers, passengers, employees and passersby who remained on or near the premises of the bus terminal.
- 18. In doing so, Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc., represented to the public, its customers, passengers, employees and passersby that all reasonable, consistent and effective steps had been and would be taken to protect and secure the safety of persons on or near the premises of the bus terminal.
- 19. Additionally, Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. was fully aware that their Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal premises were located in a dangerous and unsafe area, having been previously notified of no less than fifteen violent criminal incidents in the immediate surrounding area during the twelve months leading up to the harassment and assault of the plaintiff.
- 20. Despite all previous knowledge and notification, on December 1, 2010, the implementations, policies and procedures developed by Defendant Greyhound

Lines, Inc. as implemented at the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal, were of themselves insufficient to protect and secure the safety of all the customers, passengers, employees and passersby who remained on or near the premises of the bus terminal, given the history of criminal and violent activity on or near the premises.

- Furthermore, Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. failed to properly 21. consistently, fully and thoroughly implement sufficient the safety precautions devised by it and as a result the safety of the customers, passengers, employees and passersby who remained on or near the premises of the bus terminal was neither reasonably or adequately protected.
- On the date of the assault, Defendant Greyhound knew or should have 22. known that the security of the general premises in and around the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal was inadequate and that it placed those customers, passengers, employees and passersby, including the plaintiff, at an increased, unnecessary, unreasonably and avoidable risk of harm.
- Plaintiff, however, had been led to believe and reasonably relied upon the 23. words, communications, assurances and representations made by Defendant, Greyhound Lines, Inc. to the public in general and to him as a customer, that he would be protected from avoidable criminal assaults in the building in which he was a customer and business invitee of and that proper safety and security measures would deny entry to persons with known and/or apparent criminal and violent proclivities.
- At all times in question Defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. had undertaken 24. a specific and direct duty to protect plaintiff along with fellow customers, passengers, employees and passersby, while he was present on the premises, based on its prior

knowledge that such crimes had occurred on or near its premises in the past and were likely to occur again without adequately planned and effectuated security and safety implementations, polices, and procedures.

- This duty was breached on December 1, 2010, when George Wadis 25. gained access to the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal while wielding a deadly weapon.
- Despite the knowledge or putative knowledge that there were no security 26. guards or interior safety staff, Wadis was allowed entrance into the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal with his weapon without any impediment.
- The plaintiff had no knowledge as to the true risk of harm to which he was 27. being exposed to while inside the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal on and around December 1, 2010, and without such knowledge he had no way to know that in the absence of adequate security, he could only rely upon himself for protection.
- Had he known the true state of security in the Philadelphia Greyhound 27. Terminal on that day, he could have and would have taken steps to protect himself and to reduce the risk of harm he was negligently, carelessly and recklessly exposed to by Greyhound Lines, Inc.
 - The negligence of the defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. consisted of: 28.
 - Failing to deny entrance to individuals possessing deadly weapons; (a)
 - Failing to inspect, secure and determine breaches in security; (b)
 - Allowing individuals with deadly weapons onto the premises; (c)
 - Failing to send security personnel through the various rooms and (d) locations inside the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal so as to prevent, deter and halt the criminal activities of persons who were inside the building.

- Failing to hire, retain and employ sufficient numbers of trained (e) security staff to prevent the commission of crimes and violence upon those customers, employees, passengers and passersby of the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal;
- Failure to hire, retain, employ or deploy roving security personnel (f) so as to act as a deterrent to persons with criminal intentions and to prevent crimes against Greyhound Lines, Inc. customers, passengers, and staff in general and plaintiff in particular;
- Failing to adequately analyze the frequency and nature of ongoing (g) criminal activity, prior crimes and the security risks in its buildings so as to develop and implement an appropriate program of security and safety precautions;
- Failing to promulgate, disseminate and enforce adequate policies, (h) procedures and guidelines regarding control to building interiors and regarding the regarding the patrol for criminal activity;
- Failing to hire and retain competent, knowledgeable, diligent and (i) well trained staff so as to implement and effect adequate and effective program of security and safety precautions on the premises;
- Failing to install, maintain, repair, monitor and employ adequate (j) security devices at the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal such as metal detectors or other mechanical devices so as to reduce or eliminate the intrusion of unauthorized or unsafe persons and the commission of crimes therein;
 - Failing in the design, development, analysis and implementation of (k)

an adequate security and safety plan at Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal despite the history of criminal activity in and around the premises;

- Failing to retain, fund and effectuate services from outside (1)contractors consulted and/or hired to provide or augment security services at the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal;
- Failing to fully disclose to Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal customers, passengers, employees and the public the procedures, policies or mechanisms as implemented for the purpose of protecting them from becoming victims of crime;
- Failing to properly, reasonably and effectively implement the plan (n) of security at the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal by which Greyhound Lines, Inc. had overtly and publicly promised and undertaken to protect its customers, passengers, and employees; and
- Failing to implement and/or provide a policy to prohibit individuals (o) from carrying weapons on the premises of the Philadelphia Greyhound Terminal.
- As a result of the foregoing negligence and breach of duties by the 29. defendant the risk of harm to plaintiff was increased and such injuries and harm in fact occurred.
- As a result of his injuries, plaintiff has undergone in the past and will in the 30. future continue to undergo great pain and suffering.
- As a result of his injuries, plaintiff may have suffered a permanent 31. disability and permanent impairment of his earning power and capacity.
 - As a result of his injuries, plaintiff has suffered permanent disfigurement. 32.

33. As a result of his injuries, plaintiff may have suffered a permanent diminution of his ability to enjoy life and life's pleasures.

- 34. Plaintiff has and may in the future be compelled to expend various sums of money for medication and medical attention in attempting go remedy the aforementioned injuries.
- 35. As a result of the foregoing plaintiff suffered an unprovoked, brutal, violent attack from which he has yet to and may well never recover.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Mahady Sacko, Jr., respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against defendant Greyhound Lines, Inc. in an amount in excess of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00), plus interest, costs and attorney's fees.

DATE: 3/28/13

Respectfully submitted,

Joe H. Tucker, Jr., Esquire Bernard Smalley, Esquire

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Mahady Sacko, Jr.

VERIFICATION

I, MAHADY SACKO, hereby state that I am the Plaintiff herein, and that I verify the foregoing facts set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the statements made herein are made subject to the penalties of the 18 PA. C.S. Section 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Mahady Sacko